

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

-----  
PATRICIA WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF WORKFORCE  
DEVELOPMENT & DEPARTMENT  
OF JUSTICE,

Defendants.  
-----

ORDER

16-cv-238-bbc

In an order dated June 20, 2016, I directed the clerk of court to enter judgment in favor of defendants in this case. In her complaint, pro se plaintiff Patricia Williams alleged that lawyers for the Wisconsin Department of Justice disclosed confidential information during court proceedings, but I dismissed the claim on the ground that the alleged conduct did not give rise to a cause of action under federal law.

Now plaintiff has filed what she calls a “motion for reconsideration and statement of claim.” Dkt. #13. However, plaintiff does not identify any errors in the June 20 order. Rather, she attaches a new complaint in which she seeks to raise new claims. In particular, she alleges that the Department of Workforce Development “denied [her] entitled benefits within the DWD/DVR [job training] program,” in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Rehabilitation Act. Liberally construed, plaintiff’s motion is one for

relief from the judgment under Fed. R. Civ. 59(e) and for leave to amend her complaint under Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a). Foster v. DeLuca, 545 F.3d 582, 583-85 (7th Cir. 2008) (after judgment is entered, plaintiff may not amend complaint without asking for relief from judgment and for leave to amend).

I am denying plaintiff's motion. Even if I assume that it would be appropriate for plaintiff to reinvent her case after judgment is entered, her new complaint does not state a claim upon which relief may be granted. The Americans with Disabilities Act and the Rehabilitation Act prohibit discrimination on the basis of disability and require reasonable accommodations for individuals with a disability in certain contexts. Plaintiff alleges in her complaint that she suffers from diabetes and depression, but even if I assume that those conditions qualify as disabilities, she does not explain how either of the conditions was related to any denial of benefits and she does not identify any accommodations she believes she needed but did not receive.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff Patricia Williams's motion for relief from judgment and for leave to amend her complaint, dkt. #13, is DENIED.

Entered this 8th day of July, 2016.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

BARBARA B. CRABB

District Judge